

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto are two sheets of corrected formal drawings. The corrected formal drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

In FIG. 1, the terms “REPLYING MEANS” and “ENTRUSIN SYSTEM SERVER” have been replaced by the terms “REPLY MEANS” and “ENTRUSING SYSTEM SERVER”, respectively.

In FIG. 2, the term “REQUIRING” has been replaced by the term “REQUIRED” in Steps 201 and 202.

It is respectfully requested that the corrected formal drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

Attachment: Replacement sheets
 Annotated sheets showing changes

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 10, 11, 12 and 20 are now present in the application. The specification, abstract, drawings, and claims 1, 10, 11, 12 and 20 have been amended. Claims 2-9 and 13-19 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 12 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Specification

The specification and abstract have been amended to remove the typographical errors. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is entered. Entry of the above amendments to the specification is earnestly solicited.

Drawings Objections

Applicants have resubmitted two (2) sheets of corrected formal drawings to address the Examiner's requested changes. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's drawings objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 17, 18 and 20 have been objected to due to the presence of minor informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As the Examiner will note, claim 19 has been cancelled. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Vinciarelli, U.S. Patent No. 6,110,213. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Vinciarelli discloses a fabrication rules based automated design and manufacturing system and method. The automated custom power supply design and manufacturing system uses an expert system containing a set of rules, including manufacturing limitations to limit design choices and ensure feasibility and manufacturability of the design. A design interface collects specifications from a user. A complement of power components for satisfying the electrical specifications is defined and mechanical specifications for each component are provided by the system for use in creating the mechanical design. After the mechanical design is established a thermal analysis is performed and the completed design is returned to a host computer. After an order is received, a computer integrated manufacturing system generates all of the specifications required to manufacture the components for the system and the system.

By the present Amendment, the features of claims 2-9 are added to claim 1 and those of claims 13-19 are added to claim 12. Applicants respectfully submit that Vinciarelli fails to teach

every element of the claimed invention. The Examiner recites that Vinciarelli discloses methods for designing and manufacturing electrical equipment using expert systems that accept design choices and specifications from a user and determine feasibility and manufacturability of the design using modules that perform analyses regarding various stress factors. Vinciarelli relates to automatically designing custom power converter; however, the claimed invention relates to an entrusting system for processing the required information relating to semiconductor package. Therefore, Vinciarelli fails to teach every element of the claimed invention. Take claim 12 for example. First, the claimed invention discloses: inputting an required information about a semiconductor package by a user via an internet, wherein said required information is selected from at least one information of a substrate type, a die dimension, a thermal performance, an amount of substrate layers, numbers of input terminals and output terminals, and pitches between said input and output terminals about semiconductor package. All the required information only relates to semiconductor package. However, in Vinciarelli, the required information inputted by the user doesn't relate to semiconductor package, even though the items of the required information have the similar/same name accidentally. Furthermore, Vinciarelli fails to teach the step "producing a plurality of analysis results by a plurality of analysis modules, wherein said plurality of analysis modules are selected from at least one of a thermal analysis module, a circuit analysis module, a stress analysis module, a reliability module, a material analysis module and a substrate analysis module". Applicants want to emphasize again that said plurality of analysis modules are aimed at semiconductor package. Therefore, the detail contents of each analysis module are different from those in Vinciarelli.

According to the above-mentioned reasons, Vinciarelli also fails to teach every element of claim 1 of the claimed invention. Vinciarelli relates to automatically designing custom power converter; however, the claimed invention relates to an entrusting system for processing the required information relating to semiconductor package. Therefore, Vinciarelli fails to teach the required information, wherein said required information is selected from at least one information of a substrate type, a die dimension, a thermal performance, an amount of substrate layers, numbers of input terminals and output terminals, and pitches between said input and output terminals about semiconductor package. Moreover, Vinciarelli fails to teach a plurality of analysis modules, wherein said plurality of analysis modules are selected from at least one of a thermal analysis module, a circuit analysis module, a stress analysis module, a reliability module, a material analysis module and a substrate analysis module.

Since Vinciarelli fails to teach each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1 and 12, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 12 and their dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of Vinciarelli. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.


In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By


Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747


(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Replacement sheets
Annotated sheets showing changes
Substitute Specification
Marked-up Version of the Substitute Specification



Annotated Sheet Showing Changes



Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

